

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GREGORY ROOSEVELT POARCH,

Plaintiff,

v.

LENICK RANDY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:20-cv-01191-JDP (PC)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS  
CASE SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR  
PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE TO PROSECUTE,  
FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM, AND  
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH A COURT  
ORDER

THIRTY-DAY DEADLINE

On September 3, 2020, the court screened plaintiff's complaint, found that it failed to state a claim, and ordered plaintiff to file a first amended complaint within 30 days. ECF No. 20. Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint and the time to do so has expired. Thus, the court will order plaintiff to show cause why his case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute, failure to state a claim, and failure to comply with a court order.

To manage its docket effectively, the court imposes deadlines on litigants and requires litigants to meet those deadlines. The court may dismiss a case for plaintiff's failure to prosecute or failure to comply with a court order. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); *Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005). Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. *See Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

1 The court will give plaintiff the opportunity to explain why this case should not be  
2 dismissed for his failure to state a claim, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with a court  
3 order. Plaintiff's failure to respond to this order will constitute another failure to comply with a  
4 court order and will result in dismissal of this case. Accordingly, plaintiff must show cause  
5 within thirty days of the date of entry of this order why the court should not dismiss his case.

6 Dated: October 21, 2020

7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE